

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/538,038 | SLACK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | SCOTT LONG | 1633 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: ALLOWED

- (1) SCOTT LONG. (3) ____.
 (2) MARK MARIN. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2011

Time: 12 noon

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

21-26

Prior art documents discussed:

Yao et al. and Ueda et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/SCOTT LONG/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called to inform the applicant's representative that many claims in the application have been found allowable (namely 1, 6-13, 18-20 and 28-39). However, the examiner informed the applicant's representative that a rejection could be made on claims 21-26.

The chimeric G α 15/transducin44 and chimeric G α 16/transducin44 of Yao et al. anticipate the claimed structures encompassed by instant claims 21-26 having homology of at least 80%, 90% or 95% to SEQ ID NO:2. In fact, the chimeric G α /transducin44 G-proteins of Yao et al. have 98.6% identity to G α /gustducin44 G-proteins of the instant claims. Claims 24-26 recite that the claimed chimeric G-proteins are able to "bind to one or more of the human bitter, sweet, and umami taste receptors." The examiner notes that Ueda et al. teaches "Rod- α -transducin (G α 1) and cone- α -transducin (G α 2) are present in vertebrate taste cells" (page 7379, col.2, parag.1), thereby suggesting the inherency of this characteristic in chimeric G α /transducin44. Accordingly, the examiner does not believe claims 21-26 can be allowed as written.

The examiner suggested that an Examiner's amendment would be required. He suggested a few possibilities: (1) cancelling claims 21-26; (2) incorporating the functional language of claim 1 into claims 21 and 26; or (3) narrowing the scope of the % identity to at least 99%.

The applicant's representative informed the examiner that he would consult with his client and make contact later in the week with a response.

The applicant's representative contacted the examiner on 1/7/2011 to grant permission for an examiner's amendment, which cancels claims 21-26.